School of Theology at Claremont
10011435489

BS
2325
C55
1959

The Library

of the

School of Theology

at Claremont

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3199
1/800-626-7820

BS
2325
.C55
1959

Ernest C. Colwell
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

THE ORIGIN OF TEXTTYPES OF NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS

Recent finds of extensive early manuscript copies of New Testament books have made significant study of this topic possible. The Chester Beatty Papyri and the Bodmer Papyri—to mention no others—take us at least a full century closer to the originals than the previous oldest copies did. The Beatty Gospels (P^{45}), the Beatty Paul (P^{46}), the Beatty Apocalypse (P^{47}) and the Bodmer John (P^{66}), while not complete, are extensive enough to establish the texttype they represent for these parts of the New Testament.[1] In date they are close together—all but one in the early part of the third century, which is a long distance ahead of the great parchment codices, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, from the fourth century.

These four documents have revolutionized our understanding of the early history of the manuscript tradition of the Greek New Testament. Present day concepts of the great texttypes differ markedly from those held before the publication and study of these documents. The words "Caesarean," "Alexandrian," "Western,"—and even "Byzantine" or "Syrian"—have changed their significance as labels for groups of manuscripts in the last twenty-five years.

But before we turn to a study of these changes, a clarification of terminology is essential as preface.[2] By texttype I mean the largest

[1] Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Description and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible* (London, 1933); Victor Martin, *Papyrus Bodmer II* (Geneva, 1956 and Supplement 1958).

[2] See my discussion of terminology in "The Significance of Grouping of New Testament Manuscripts," *NTS*, IV (1958), 73-92.

identifiable group of related New Testament manuscripts. This is the category familiar under Westcott and Hort's labels as "Neutral," "Alexandrian," "Western," and "Syrian." It is easily distinguished from the "family," the smallest and most intimately related group—a group whose inter-relationships are so close that its stemma or family-tree can be established with exactness. While the members of a family come from a short span of time and a specific place, the members of a texttype scatter over the centuries and the continents. Nor does the contrast end there. A family is *one* group: e.g., section *a* of the Ferrar Group (fam. 13a), but a texttype may be composed of tribes (like the Ferrar Group as a whole) and of sub-texttypes (like the two main divisions of the so-called "Caesarean" texttype).

The caution is necessary that attribution of a specific manuscript or Church Father to one of these texttypes has often been hastily and carelessly done. In a recent article, I have argued that three steps are necessary to the accurate establishment of relationship: (1) establishing agreement where the evidence splits three or more ways; (2) establishing agreement in readings peculiar to the texttype; (3) establishing agreement in a large majority of the total number of readings where variation exists. The first of these steps is a labor-saving direction finder; it rapidly points to the area of major relationship. The second is the essential demonstration of a significant amount of agreement in the distinctive features of the type. The third is the confirmation of relationship by quantitative demonstration, without which other tests often mislead the student.[3]

When we turn to the statements of the handbooks on texttypes we find them usually dated as to origin in the end of the third or in the fourth century, and their "making" is usually associated with specific Fathers: Lucian, Hesychius, and Origen. J. L. Hug made this connection in the early nineteenth century, and a dozen others have done likewise.[4] Leo Vaganay in his fine manual repeats this tradition, and usually treats the texttypes as the work of an individual.[5] The one big exception is the "Western Text" which he does

[3] "Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript within the Manuscript Tradition of the Greek New Testament." *Studia Evangelica, Texte u. Unters.* 73 (Berlin, 1959), 757-777. Further studies have demonstrated the value of this third step in the demonstration of relationship, and have made possible a refinement of method which I hope to publish soon.

[4] J. L. Hug in *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, summarized by L. Vaganay, *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Eng. trans., London, 1937), p. 162.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 115, "The Egyptian or Hesychius' Recension" (4th Century), p. 112; "Lucian's Recension" (4th Century), p. 113; "The Palestinian or

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

not attribute to an individual, and which he characterizes as universal, ancient, and lacking in homogeneity. Can this legitimately be called a texttype? On page 118, Vaganay inclines to differentiate this "Western Text" from the great Greek recensions and the somewhat later Vulgate versions.

But Vaganay, somewhat inconsistently, elsewhere (pp. 101 and 113) supposes "the first systematic revisions to have been made in the second century." He bases this directly on a statement by Origen:

> Nowadays, as is evident, there is a great diversity between the various manuscripts, either through the negligence of certain copyists, or the perverse audacity shown by some in correcting the text, or through the fault of those who, playing the part of correctors, lengthen or shorten it as they please (*In Matth. tom.* xv, 14; *P.G.* xiii. 1293).[6]

Vaganay elsewhere treats the making of the Hesychian or Alexandrian revision as a process, and he is led to this by his discussion of P^{45} in John and Luke.[7]

It must be noted, however, that different scholars exempt a specific texttype from a date-of-origin. Hort's assumption (now held to be invalid) that the Neutral texttype was an unedited preservation of the original placed its origin at the beginning. The counterblast of early twentieth-century champions of the Western texttype claimed it to be primitive and unedited, hence as "original" in date as Hort's claim made the Neutral. Everyone has since the days of Hort admitted the existence of a date-of-origin for his Syrian text, also called the Byzantine texttype or the *Koine*.

The first action required by the new evidence is to split the fourth-century date for the origin of the texttypes in half and to push the halves apart.

All the texttypes *began* earlier than we had assumed. The Bodmer John is essentially a witness to the Beta texttype (Hort's "Neutral"), but it is far from identical with the consensus of the later witnesses to this texttype.

But the Bodmer John (P^{66}) is also a witness to the early existence of many of the readings found in the Alpha texttype (Hort's "Syrian"). Strangely enough to our previous ideas, the contemporary corrections in that papyrus frequently change an Alpha-type

---

Pamphilus Recension," possibly "the edition, more or less retouched, of Origen's Palestinian text."

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 101.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 119.

reading to a Beta-type reading (Hort's "Neutral"). This indicates that at this early period readings of both kinds were known, and the Beta-type were supplanting the Alpha-type—at least as far as this witness is concerned.

These same points had been noted by Gunther Zuntz in his magnificent study of the text of the Epistles. He located P^{46} with B 1739 sah boh Clem Orig as "proto-Alexandrian."[8]
He says,

> The Alexandrian work in the text of the Scriptures (in the Epistles) was a long process rather than a single act. Its beginnings were inconspicuous, and roughly 150 years passed before it culminated in the "Euthalian" edition. Prior to this final achievement, the Alexandrian correctors strove, in ever repeated efforts, to keep the text current in their sphere free from the many faults that had infected it in the previous period and which tended to crop up again even after they had been obelized. These labours must time and again have been checked by persecutions and the confiscation of Christian books, and counteracted by the continuing currency of manuscripts of the older type. None the less they resulted in the emergence of a type of text (as distinct from a definite edition) which served as a norm for the correctors in provincial Egyptian scriptoria. The final result was the survival of a text far superior to that of the second century, even though the revisers, being fallible humans, rejected some of its correct readings and introduced some faults of their own.

He would put P^{46} nearer the beginning than the end of this process. He locates the publication of the Pauline Corpus in Alexandria about A.D. 100; and argues cogently that "in the latter half of the second century the Alexandrian bishopric possessed a scriptorium, which by its output set the standard for the Alexandrian type of Biblical manuscript."[9]

Zuntz also found P^{46} a witness for the existence of Byzantine (our Alpha type) readings in the second century. His statement deserves full quotation :

> "A number of Byzantine readings, most of them genuine, which previously were discarded as 'late', are anticipated by P^{46}.[10] Our inquiry has confirmed what was anyhow

[8] Gunther Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles* (Oxford, 1953), p. 156.
[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 271-273.
[10] The same is true of the sister-manuscript P^{45}; see, for example, Matt. xxvi.

> probable enough: the Byzantines did not hit upon these readings by conjecture or independent error. They reproduced an older tradition. The existence of this tradition was in several cases borne out by some versions or patristic quotations; but where such evidence is not forthcoming, the inference proved no less certain. How then—so one is tempted to go on asking—where no Chester Beatty papyrus happens to vouch for the early existence of a Byzantine reading? Are all Byzantine readings ancient? In the cognate case of the Homeric tradition G. Pasquali[11] answers the same question in the affirmative; and, indeed, it seems to me unlikely that the Byzantine editors ever altered the text without manuscript evidence. They left so many hopelessly difficult places unassailed! Their method, I submit, was selection rather than conjecture.[12]

Thus P^{46} argues for the Beta texttype as a process, and argues further for an early date for the beginning of that process and for the antiquity of Byzantine readings—though not necessarily for their originality.

One of the Beatty papyri (P^{45}), in the Gospel of Mark had the same effect on the Caesarean texttype which had been established by the work of Streeter and of Lake, Blake, and New.[13] The discerning eye of Ayuso saw that P^{45} split the Caesarean witnesses into two groups: P^{45} fam 1 28 W Orig; and Theta fam 13 565 700.[14] Here also the papyrus witness established a proto-group. Here also it went with "weaker" members against the "leaders" of the type—a fact which Zuntz noted of some of P^{46}'s readings within the Alexandrian group. Here also some of the readings of P^{45} anticipated Alpha-type readings found in the Textus Receptus.

The Beatty papyrus of the Apocalypse (P^{47}) had an equally important influence on the writing of the history of the manuscript tradition of that book. The writing of that history has been the

---

7 (*Chronique d'Egypte*, xxvi, 1951, 200) and Acts xvii. 13. Cf. above, p. 24, n. 3 (Heb. vii. 1). (True also of P^{66}.)

11 *Storia del tradizione*, 1934, p. 241.

12 *Ibid.*, p. 55.

13 Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (New York, 1925), chap. IV.

14 T. Ayuso in an article in *Biblica*, 16 (1935), 369-415; this grouping was accepted by the Lakes (in *Studies and Documents*, V [1937], 4, n. 5; and in *Revue Biblique*, XLVIII [1939], 497-505), and this revision of Caesarean grouping is reviewed by B. Metzger in *JBL*, LXIV (1945), 457-89; LXVI (1947), 406-7.

monumental work of Josef Schmid. The results of his life's work are now available in a series of monographs and volumes which are indispensable for any student of this subject.[15] He establishes four texttypes of the Apocalypse. Before his study, previous scholars had made one group of the old uncials A, C, S. Schmid is able with the help of P^{47} to split these into two types: A and C; and P^{47} and S. The other two types are the Andreas type and the *Koine* (Alpha or Byzantine). Schmid demonstrates the superiority of the AC type to all others, the superiority of $P^{47}S$ to the largely "corrected" types, Andreas and K. Here again the early papyrus and its kinfolk seem to me to present a proto-group. The date of the actual documents (P^{47} and Sinaiticus) is earlier than the date of the documents (Alexandrinus and Ephraemi Rescriptus) which contain the best type. I anticipate my criticism of Schmid in saying that $P^{47}S$ can be placed at an early stage in the development of AC.

Just as significant as the discovery of manuscripts is the theoretical work done by scholars. For the reconstruction of the history of the manuscript tradition, the work of the two scholars already quoted is of the greatest value. Josef Schmid in his final volume[16] is explicitly working on this task. This final structure stands on the foundation of his earlier careful studies of groupings of MSS within the major groups; and also—importantly—on his study of the Greek idiom of the Apocalypse. It is not extravagant to say that in comprehensiveness and careful accuracy he has surpassed all previous studies of the Greek manuscript tradition of any part of the New Testament, including the fine work of Ropes on Acts, of the Lakes and their associates on Mark, and of von Soden on the *pericope adulterae*. He has related the existing codices to each other in families, occasionally in tribes, and in texttypes. His work carries our knowledge beyond the stage to which the labors of Hoskier carried it, and it is the library to which the student of any newly discovered manuscript of the Apocalypse must turn for guidance.

Schmid pays Hoskier a deserved tribute for his publication of the manuscript evidence available to him. He also condemns Hoskier, justly, for his fantastic theoretical reconstruction of the tradition. It may be that Schmid was influenced toward caution in this latter

[15] *Der Apk-Text des Arethas von Kaisareia und einiger anderer jüngerer gruppen* (Athens, 1936); "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des griechischen Apk-Textes, Der K-Text" (*Biblica* 17, 1936); *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes, 1. Teil: Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia, Text* (Munich, 1955); *Einleitung* (Munich, 1956); *2. Teil: Die alten Stämme* (Munich, 1955).

[16] *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes, 2. Teil: Die alten Stämme.*

area by Hoskier's failure; at any rate, he leaves the last chapter unwritten.

His summary of results[17] starts off very crisply in numbered paragraphs, which stay brief through number 4.

> In brief, the established results are now put together. In part they consist of clear and certain knowledge; in part they inclose problems for which a definite solution is not possible.
>
> 1. The entire Greek tradition of the Apocalypse-Text divides into four stems, namely AC, $P^{47}S$, Av and K.
> 2. Av and K are two sharply distinct recensions. Their peculiar readings consist for the most part of corrections.
> 3. Av and K are not completely independent of each other (as Bousset and von Soden insisted). They have a common stem which though not extensive is clearly recognizable in a number of common corrections. In several places they contain the original Text against A(C) (P^{47})S. It follows from this that they are not merely later forms of the 'older' Text extant in AC and $P^{47}S$.
> 4. The 'older' Text divides again into two Text forms, AC and $P^{47}S$ which are to be clearly distinguished. Of these, $P^{47}S$ contains a not insignificant number of corrections, while these are almost entirely lacking in the archetype of AC. In one single passage $P^{47}S$ alone have the original Text.[18]

But paragraph 5 is as long as the first four together. It begins with the statement that the AC texttype (which includes Oecumenius and the Vulgate) outranks all others in the value of its evidence, but it takes a long paragraph to state that AC is not identical with the Ur-text.

His sixth conclusion is equally lengthy. It argues that since "each of the texttypes has preserved the Ur-text in at least some passages, . . . the texttypes which stand farthest from the original are not to be understood as later, revised forms of their elders in the textual tradition."

In the seventh place, Schmid, recognizing the existence of an interconnection between all texttypes and their constituent parts, concludes "that it is not possible to establish the present connections

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 146-51.

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 146-7.

of the major texttypes of the Greek Apocalypse Text-tradition with complete accuracy, and to arrange them all in a *Stemma*." All the texttypes, Schmid concludes, are older than the MSS A and C and reach back at least into the fourth century.

His final (eighth) point reaffirms the relative value of the witnesses in descending order A, C, P^{47}, S.

Schmid is weak where Zuntz is strong: in the clear recognition of the implication of the data for the interrelationship of the major texttypes. Schmid overrates agreement in the original reading as evidence for common lineage. He underrates the possibility of coincidental agreement in error; e.g. 13:7 where in AC, P^{47}, Av an entire sentence has fallen out as the result of homoioteleuton. The presence of the sentence in S and K shows no more than that the error has not occurred there. As a matter of fact, this omission is not universal in Av (cf. Schmid's edition of the Andreas Commentary [p. 139, apparatus to line 1] which cites three Andreas families and two other Andreas MSS against the omission), nor is it universal in K.

But the major mistake is made in thinking of the "old texttypes" as frozen blocks, even after admitting that no one manuscript is a perfect witness to any texttype. *If* no one MS is a perfect witness to any type, then all witnesses are mixed in ancestry (or individually corrupted, and thus parents of mixture). The mixture was, we are certain, partial.[19] It did not remove all original readings; it did not remove all the distinctive readings of the texttype to which the codex belonged. Beyond this we now recognize that the texttypes developed, they grew, they are a process starting in the second century and proceeding by selection from available readings, from available "good, old MSS," and proceeding also into new paths under local standards of excellence in syntax and in doctrine.

Quae cum ita sint, agreements of the late texttype K with an early texttype or MS in the original reading is due to the survival of that original reading in some one of the various channels that make up the complex ancestry of K. Agreements of this kind do *not* move K as an entity (as a texttype) back to the date of the earlier texttype or MS. Even if, and it is too big an if, every reading found in K existed somewhere in the second century, K did not exist in the second century. If the term "texttype" means anything, it means that entire complex of readings in its total pattern which we refer to as "the Alpha texttype" or "the Byzantine text" or "the K text-

[19] *Ibid.;* Schmid gives evidence for this again and again in the course of his work.

type." This did not exist as the dominant element in any MS in the second century. It does exist in the ninth century and later. The clinching evidence for the date of a texttype is a datable MS *belonging* to it, or a Church Father who uses it as Cyprian used the "Western" type found in K.

Schmid's first five conclusions are solidly established, and the ranking of the four oldest witnesses in his eighth seems equally sound. But the claim in number 6 that the later texttypes are not revised forms of their elders seems doubtful. All that has been proved is that they are not *entirely* derived from their elders. If, however, there stands "at the beginning of the text a text handled by humble piety and therefore a text with little unity," all texttypes must derive from this and/or from each other plus a modicum of "new" editorial contribution. What needs clarification in Schmid's sixth conclusion is not only the meaning of "later" *in re* a texttype, but also the meaning of a "revised form" of an older texttype. Revision almost universally proceeded on a documentary basis. MSS from outside the texttype were used to revise it. This opened a door through which Ur-text readings could be added just as surely as it opened the door to alien corrections and corruptions.[20] This challenges also his seventh conclusion that a stemma of texttypes cannot be made. I am confident that he has supplied the data that makes this possible—at least in large outlines.

To focus the material surveyed here into sharp statement as a basis for criticism and further study is the purpose of the following propositions:

1. *A texttype is a process, not the work of one hand.*

Scholars have been forced to the conclusion that a texttype is a process not from the study of the loosely-connected "Western" witnesses but from the study of the Beta texttype—Hort's "neutral." This was implicit in Hort's own identification of his "Alexandrian" text, intimately related to his Neutral. Vaganay's argument for process came from his study of the relationship of P^{45} to the Beta texttype in Luke and John. Zuntz's argument has been quoted above (pp. 131-32). Schmid sharply differentiates Av and K from AC and $P^{47}S$, and the differentiation includes the recognition of process as more extensive in AC and $P^{47}S$ than in the other two

[20] But before Schmid's argument for a fourth-century date for Av is rejected, the evidence (which Schmid refers to) of S^{a}'s (the fourth century corrector of Sinaiticus) agreement with Av must be explained—Schmid, *op. cit.*, p. 129. Schmid's argument here rests on his acceptance of the conclusions drawn by Bousset (*Studien*, pp. 42-44). Bousset's work should be reviewed in the light of current understanding of the history of texttypes.

types. My own earlier study of the Beta texttype in Mark drove me to the recognition of "process" in the formation of a texttype.[21]

2. *The Vulgate Versions were the work of one hand and were editions as well as translations.*

3. *The Greek Vulgate—The Byzantine or Alpha texttype—had in its origin no such single focus as the Latin had in Jerome. Like Jerome's Vulgate it had several revised editions.*

4. *Origen did not make an edition (create a texttype) of the Greek New Testament.*

5. *The so-called Western text or Delta texttype is the uncontrolled popular text of the second century. It has no unity and should not be referred to as the "Western text."*

(*a*) Even Zuntz (with whom I find it hard to differ) once refers to the text of the New Testament in the second century as if it were a unity: "The final result was the survival of a text far superior to that of the second century . . ." (quoted above, p. 131). Schmid did not work out the inter-relations of his four types except that he grouped the first two (AC and $P^{47}S$) as closer to each other than they were to the last two, and the last two (Av and K) as closer to each other than they were to the first two. (*b*) Schmid's work is limited to the Greek tradition, which does not contain the equivalent of MS D. Without D and the versions in the Gospel of John, where would we find this texttype(s)? (*c*) If the answer is "the Fathers," Schmid's findings still seem to exclude "Western" types. Origen's text is generally identical with $P^{47}S$, Hippolytus of Rome with AC Oec. Irenaeus seems not very different from AC Oec; and Clement, Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Methodius have few, inconclusive quotes (pp. 156-171). (*d*) Did the Apocalypse enjoy widespread popular usage in the second century?

Is it far-fetched to regard his type $P^{47}S$ as a stage on the way from the second-century types to the "better" Beta texttype of AC Oec? As such a stage $P^{47}S$ Orig would contain a number of readings which earlier nomenclature would have labelled as "Western," meaning early non-Neutral. Schmid, by his separation of $P^{47}S$ Orig from the "Neutral" AC Oec, is saying the same thing. He will not call them "Western" in a geographical sense because of the absence of Latin support. But Western has ceased to be a geographical term for a long time.

6. *The Beta texttype (Hort's "Neutral") is a "made" text probably Alexandrian in origin, produced in part by the selection of relatively "good old MSS" but more importantly by the philological editorial know-how of Alexandrians.* Zuntz's reconstruction of this process is superb.

[21] *See* "Genealogical Method," *JBL*, LXI (1947), pp. 119, 123.

7. *The so-called Caesarean texttype is not Caesarean and is at least two types, the earlier of which is a proto-type, an early stage in the process which produced the mature Beta and Delta texttypes.*

8. *It follows from number* 1, *as also from the textual data, that the earliest witness to a texttype is never the archetype of the texttype.*

Thus Schmid tells us that P is not the archetype of Av, and Q even less the archetype of K. He shows that P^{47} and S, though earlier than A and C, are not as good witnesses as the later MSS. The Lakes identified Theta 700 and 565 as the strongest Caesarean witnesses in Mark, but P^{45} is the earliest and agrees with the weaker witnesses. A in the Gospels is the earliest member of the Alpha texttype, but it does not fit into any of the major editions of that type, not even Family π, as Silva Lake has shown. P^{66} can be claimed for the Beta texttype in John but it is far from the center of the group. Zuntz put P^{46} with 1739 and B as, at times, a proto-Beta texttype in the Epistles. His inclusion of B is in my judgment an error. *Some* of the readings of B are derived from the proto-Beta texttype of which P^{46} is a member, but we cannot relocate an entire MS on the basis of a small minority of its readings.

9. *The textual history of the New Testament differs from corpus to corpus, and even from book to book; therefore the witnesses have to be regrouped in each new section.*

Schmid shows this in striking fashion for the Apocalypse vis-à-vis the Praxapostolos:

> Bei der über 80 HSS umfassenden K-gruppe lässt sich feststellen, das Schwester-HSS im Apk-Text dies fast niemals auch im Praxapostolos sind, und dass umgekehrt Schwester-HSS im Praxapostolos fast nie in der Apk unmittelbare Schwestern sind.

He then gives more than half-a-dozen examples.[22]

10. *As in dating documents, so in dating texttypes what is needed is a datable witness to the type, not only to some of its readings, for the overwhelming majority of readings were created before the year* 200. *But very few, if any, texttypes were established by that time.*

The agreement of Origen with P^{47} in the Apocalypse and with P^{45} in Mark exhorts us to pay more attention to date in interpreting the history of the tradition in the future. Thus in writing the history of the texttypes we should begin with the earliest witness, as Zuntz did in his study of the Epistles.

[22] Schmid, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-38. See my examples of alternations of type even within one manuscript in "Grouping of New Testament Manuscripts," *NTS*, IV (1958), pp. 89-90.

A060665
THEOLOGY LIBRARY

BS
2325
.C55
1959

The origin of the texttypes
Testament manuscripts / Er
Colwell. -- [S.l. : s.n.,
p. 128-138 ; 22 cm.
Reprint of a journal artic
Includes bibliographical r

1. Bible. N.T.--Criticism,
I. Title II. Title: Origin
types of New Testament manus

A060665

CCSC 04 JAN 95 31766606 CSTMxc